DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 075 888 24 EA 004 452

AUTHOR	Stout, Robert T.
TITLE	New Approaches to Recruitment and Selection of Educational Administrators. ERIC/CEM-UCEA Series on Administrator Preparation. ERIC/CEM State-of-the-Knowledge Series, Number Eighteen. UCEA Monograph Series, Number Five.
INSTITUTION	Oregon Univ., Eugene. ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management.; University Council for Educational Administration, Columbus, Ohio.
SPONS AGENCY	National Center for Educational Research and Development (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
BUREAU NO	BR-8-0353
PUB DATE	73
CONTRACT	OEC-0-8-080353-3514
NOTE	53p.
AVAILABLE FROM	University Council for Educational Administration, 29 West Woodruff Avenue, Columbus, Ohio 43210 ($2.00 Quantity Discounts)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Administrative Personnel; Administrator Characteristics; *Administrator Education; *Administrator Selection; Admission Criteria; Bibliographies; Bureaucracy; *Educational Administration; *Educational Change; Educational Objectives; Philosophy; Professional Training; Recruitment; Schools of Education
IDENTIFIERS	*Change Strategies

ABSTRACT

In this monograph, the author claims there is a need for administrators who are responsive to legitimate demands for educational change. He reviews the shortcomings of contemporary American educational systems and traditional procedures for selecting and preparing administrators -- a group noted for its size and homogeneity. The author contends that recruiting innovative personnel is difficult because so little being known of the change process, the likelihood of conflict is great. Nonetheless, there exists a need for diversity of educational goals. He discussess the role that is played by universities attempting to design training programs for producing a variety of administrator types and explains the necessity of their having to recruit from nontraditional sources, i.e., from the ranks of "unsuccessful" teachers or nonteachers. New criteria for selecting trainees are proposed. A selective bibliography is appended. (M)

ED 075888

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

New Approaches to Recruitment and Selection of Educational Administrators

Robert T. Stout

1973

EA 004 452

Commissioned by
ERIC Clearinghouse on
Educational Management

Published by
University Council for
Educational Administration

ERIC/CEM–UCEA Series on Administrator Preparation

Under the editorship of

Philip K. Piele, Director

ERIC Clearinghouse
on Educational Management
University of Oregon

and

Jack Culbertson, Executive Director

University Council
for Educational Administration
The Ohio State University

The ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management operates under contract with the National Institute of Education of the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. This publication was prepared pursuant to that contract. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Points of view or opinions do not, therefore, necessarily represent official National Institute of Education position or policy.

Library of Congress Catalog Number: 72-86751
ERIC/CEM Accession Number: EA 004 452

ERIC/CEM State-of-the-Knowledge Series, Number Eighteen
UCEA Monograph Series, Number Five

Manuscript edited by Ian Templeton

Printed in the United States of America
Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc.
19 North Jackson
Danville, Illinois 61832

Titles in This Series

1. **Preparing Educational Leaders: A Review of Recent Literature,** by Robin H. Farquhar and Philip K. Piele

2. **Unconventional Methods and Materials for Preparing Educational Administrators,** by Richard Wynn

3. **Emergent Practices in the Continuing Education of School Administrators,** by Frank W. Lutz and Reynolds Ferrante

4. **Training-in-Common for Educational, Business, and Public Administrators,** by Erwin Miklos

5. **New Approaches to Recruitment and Selection of Educational Administrators,** by Robert T. Stout

6. **The Preparation of School Administrators in Quantitative Analysis,** by James E. Bruno

7. **The Use of Computers in Administrator Preparation,** by E. Wailand Bessent and Philip K. Piele

8. **Innovative Strategies in Field Experiences for Preparing Administrators,** by Peter P. Horoschak and Joseph M. Cronin

Copies, at $2.00 each, can be purchased from the University Council for Educational Administration, 29 West Woodruff Avenue, Columbus, Ohio 43210. Quantity discounts as follows: 2 to 24 copies, $1.80 each; 25 or more copies, $1.60 each.

ERIC/CEM

The Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) is a national information system operated by the National Institute of Education. ERIC serves the educational community by disseminating educational research results and other resource information that can be used in developing more effective educational programs.

The ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, one of eighteen such units in the system, was established at the University of Oregon in 1966. The Clearinghouse and its seventeen companion units process research reports and journal articles for announcement in ERIC's index and abstract bulletins.

Research reports are announced in *Research in Education (RIE)*, available in many libraries and by subscription for $38 a year from the United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. Most of the documents listed in *RIE* can be purchased through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service, operated by Leasco Information Products, Inc.

Journal articles are announced in *Current Index to Journals in Education. CIJE* is also available in many libraries and can be ordered for $44 a year from Macmillan Information, 866 Third Avenue, New York, New York 10022. Annual and semiannual cumulations can be ordered separately.

Besides processing documents and journal articles, the Clearinghouse has another major function—information analysis and synthesis. The Clearinghouse prepares bibliographies, literature reviews, state-of-the-knowledge papers, and other interpretive research studies on topics in its area.

UCEA

The mission of the University Council for Educational Administration is to improve the preparation of administrative personnel in education. Its membership consists of major universities in the United States and Canada. UCEA's central staff works with and through scholars in member universities to create new standards and practices in administrator preparation and to disseminate the results to interested institutions.

UCEA's interest in the professional preparation of educational administrators includes both continuing education and resident, preservice programs. Interinstitutional cooperation and communication are basic tools used in development activities; both administrators and professors participate in projects.

The Council's efforts currently are divided into six areas: developing and testing strategies for improving administrative and leadership practices in school systems; encouraging an effective flow of leaders into preparatory programs and posts of educational administration; advancing research and its dissemination; providing information and ideas helpful to those in universities responsible for designing preparatory programs; integrating and improving preparatory programs in specific areas of administration; and developing and evaluating the Monroe City URBSIM simulation and support materials.

Contents

FOREWORD vii

1. INTRODUCTION 1

2. TRADITIONAL PRACTICES 6
   - Characteristics of Administrators 6
   - The Role of Universities 10
   - Traditional Recruiting Pools 16

3. CHANGE AND THE SCHOOLS 20
   - Directions and Results 20
   - Conflict over the Purposes of Schooling 21
   - Administrators and Change 24

4. NEW PRACTICES. 27
   - New Recruiting Pools 27
   - New Selection Criteria 33

5. THE FUTURE 41

BIBLIOGRAPHY 44

Foreword

During the last decade, programs to prepare educational administrators have undergone considerable change. Growing specialization in the field of educational administration resulting from new knowledge production (for example, operations research) is one reason for the program change. Another is the continuing search for more effective patterns of field experience, instructional method, and content in preparatory programs.

Because of the varied changes achieved in preparation in different universities, those interested in designing or updating programs today are faced with a greater number of options than was the case ten years ago. A major purpose of this monograph series is to shed light on the various options now available to those interested in administrator preparation. A second purpose is to advance general understanding of developments in preparation during the past decade. The series is directed to professors, students, and administrators interested in acquiring information on various aspects of preparation.

Each author in the series has been asked to define the parameters of his subject, review and analyze recent pertinent literature and research, describe promising new practices emerging in actual training programs across the country, and identify knowledge gaps and project future developments. The papers in the series were planned and developed cooperatively by the ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management and the University Council for Educational Administration. The editors of the series hope that the monographs will prove valuable to those interested in understanding and assessing recent and projected developments in preparation.

In this monograph, the fifth in the series, Robert T. Stout advocates the use of new methods to recruit and select a new breed of persons to become school administrators. He explains why different kinds of administrators are needed for American schools today and describes new practices by which such persons may be recruited and selected.

Dr. Stout is a professor of education and director of the Administrator Preparation Program of the Claremont Graduate School. From 1970 to 1973 he was coordinator of the National Program for Educational Leadership at the Claremont Graduate School. He holds a bachelor's degree from Carleton College (1959) and a doctor's degree from the University of Chicago (1966).

Dr. Stout has written extensively on such subjects as educational inequality, educational politics, school desegregation, and educational leadership. He is a coauthor with James Guthrie, Henry Levin, and George Kleindorfer of a book, *Schools and Inequality*, published by M.I.T. Press in 1971.

PHILIP K. PIELE
JACK CULBERTSON

1

Introduction

In one sense a paper on this topic is not necessary. A statement attributed to Cubberly describes the kind of people who should be recruited for preparation as educational administrators:

> The opportunities offered in this new profession [school administration] to men of strong character, broad sympathies, high purposes, fine culture, courage, exact training and executive skill, who are willing to take the time and spend the energy necessary to prepare themselves for large service, are today not excelled in any of the professions, learned or otherwise. No profession offers such large personal rewards, for the opportunity of living one's life in moulding other lives, and in helping to improve materially the intellectual tone and the moral character of a community, offers a personal reward that makes a peculiarly strong appeal to certain fine types of men and women. (AASA 1971)

However, for some reason—whether no one was listening to Cubberly's recruiting pitch, or the universities intervened between candidate selection and careers, or the world is a tangled place—the current state of public schooling in the United States is distressing

to many people. It may be that the men and women of whom Cubberly spoke are the administrators of today. If this is so, then the world is indeed a tangled place in which people of heroic qualities are able to exert only a limited influence.

On the other hand, school administrators have been accused of standing idly by, if not of contributing to the failings in American schooling that are apparent to many people.

Perhaps it is useful to review some major descriptions of American education and its shortcomings as a background for understanding the reasons for the development of new selection and recruitment methods.

First, equality of opportunity does not exist in American education. No matter how one defines equality of opportunity, the truth is that some groups of children receive better schooling than others. While scholarly discussion about the causes and limits of inequality continues, the achievement of some groups lags farther behind that of others. The summary findings of the Coleman report are instructive.

> For most minority groups, then, and most particularly the Negro, schools provide little opportunity for them to overcome this initial deficiency [lower scores on standardized achievement tests]; in fact they fall farther behind the white majority in the development of several skills which are critical to making a living and participating fully in modern society. (Coleman and others 1966, p. 21)

Published data continue to confirm that the schools do not educate vast numbers of poor and ethnic minority students.

Second, schools are isolating places. Children of ethnic minorities are isolated from children of the majority. Middle-class children are isolated from less-well-off children. Young children are isolated from male adults. Suburban children are isolated from city children. And it is said by many that while children are in school they are isolated from life (U.S. Commission on Civil Rights 1967). As Waller (1932) noted, "They [the children of poor and humble parents] are those whom the teachers do not favor; they are the ones excluded from things exclusive." Despite the passing of forty years since Waller's writing, exclusion has not ceased to be a part of schooling.

Third, schools distribute educational resources unequally. That is, schools tend to distribute resources in such ways that children of higher social status receive more and higher quality services than

children of lower social status. The authors of a recently completed Michigan study conclude:

> We have chosen to address ourselves to the relationships between socioeconomic status and school services on three levels. Our data are consistent and broad in scope. On the basis of this information, we have no doubt that our original assertion is true; to be an elementary school child of lower socioeconomic status is to experience an extraordinary probability of discriminatory treatment. High-quality school services are provided to children from wealthy homes. Poor-quality school services are provided to children from poor homes. (Guthrie and others 1971; see also Thomas 1968)

Although the authors make no claim that their data reflect distribution patterns in other states, it is not inconceivable that such is the case.*

An additional factor affecting resource distribution is federal money. There is criticism of two mechanisms in the distribution of this money that, in some cases, work independently to increase inequalities. The first is a federal policy mandating allocation of federal funds through state education agencies. The allocation often requires matching funds and is generally made on the basis of project proposals submitted by local education agencies. Wealthier districts are more likely to have matching funds and the personnel to write project proposals than are poorer districts (Guthrie and Lawton 1969).

The second mechanism is activated when a school district submits a project proposal that provides for a substantial number of "central office" positions or other sundry items. These extra services may or may not be made available to poor children in the district. Some school districts have used Title I (of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act) federal moneys intended for services to poor children to support other purposes (Martin and McClure 1969).

It is reasonably clear that when educational resources are distributed by local school authorities, distribution patterns may reflect systematic and wide-ranging inequities: poor children often receive fewer services than wealthy children.

---

*The recent proliferation of law suits under the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution bears witness to widespread perception of disparities in the provision of services among school districts within a state.

Fourth, the governance of schools tends to be the prerogative of a few people who are perceived by others as generally unresponsive to legitimate demands of large numbers of people. One need not look far for an organization or a group of citizens that is demanding access to the decision-making structures of schools on the grounds that the group's legitimate claims to such access have been denied. Teacher unions are demanding such access. So, too, are citizens who demand decentralization, reorganization, community control, schooling vouchers, and a variety of other new governing structures. All these citizens believe their interests are being ill-served by the schools.

Fifth, the public schools have become a costly social enterprise. They have become so expensive that citizens appear unwilling to continue to tax themselves at ever-increasing rates without questioning the relationship between cost and value received. Across the United States, state legislatures are demanding that school districts adopt accounting practices that permit more detailed analyses of expenditure patterns. Lawmakers and citizens alike are demanding that schools be "accountable," presumably to some set of goals.*

Finally, numerous critics argue that schools are inhumane places in which children and youths are systematically forced into social and economic roles that are neither moral nor human (Holt 1964 and Kozol 1967). These critics contend that as children progress through schools they are taught to be cynical, prejudiced, insensitive, docile, and, on occasion, fascist. Such critics take seriously the idea that education is liberating whereas schooling is debilitating to the human spirit.

Imbedded in these arguments and accusations is the contention that someone should begin correcting the shortcomings and failures of the schools. There is, probably, no consensus about who should do the work nor what should be done. One assumption of this paper, however, is that, at the least, school administrators should be responsible for instituting some improvements.

In general there are two ways to obtain school administrators

---

*In a recent Gallup poll, 67 percent of those polled favored a "system that would hold teachers and administrators more accountable for the progress of students," and 58 percent agreed that teachers should be paid on the basis of the quality of their work rather than according to a single salary scale. "Second Annual Survey of the Public's Attitude toward the Public Schools." *Phi Delta Kappan*, (October 1970).

who can be expected to institute educational reforms. First, current administrators can respond positively to the demand for change. Second, different, more responsive persons can be made school administrators. A second assumption of this paper is that new recruiting and selecting methods are being developed as a strategy for recruiting and selecting different kinds of people into school administration. These new people, it is presumed, will take seriously the challenges and opportunities for effecting change in the schools.

2

Traditional Practices

Before examining traditional recruiting pools, it is necessary to discuss, first, the characteristics of present administrators and, second, the role of universities in the recruiting and selection processes.

Characteristics of Administrators

The most obvious characteristic of educational administrators as a group is its size; approximately 150,000 men and women are included. Another obvious characteristic is the group's homogeneity; its members are very much like one another in a number of attributes and functions.

Neither observation should astound anyone: the first because there are a great many schools; the second because one mark of a developed occupational group, particularly a so-called professional one, is that its members exert substantial control over recruitment and selection into the group. Thus, the homogeneity of the group is explained by internal control: prospective members are selected

according to criteria that reflect the common attributes of the current members.

The homogeneity of administrators is of interest because it is at variance with the heterogeneity of students and citizens. The consequences of this variance are not certain, but many citizens in large cities consider them important enough that they have sought the appointment of administrators who are more like themselves according to certain criteria.

My statement that educational administrators are a homogeneous group is empirically based. Although the data are neither exhaustive nor particularly rich, they do permit some cautious inferring.

Campbell and his colleagues at the University of Chicago (1967) studied state departments of education in three states: one large, one medium, and one small. Although their purpose was to analyze the potential for strengthening the departments, one phase of the research is of particular interest here. Kirby and Tollman collected data on recruitment and selection into, and career patterns within, the departments. They concluded:

> The most obvious generalization which can be made in summarizing our analysis is that the professional personnel in each of the states we studied comprise extremely homogeneous groups. These state departments of education are largely composed of men who have lived their lives in the rural areas of states they serve; who have gone to a state teachers college and perhaps the state university; who had begun careers as professional educators, generally in rural schools, before entering the department; and who had been invited to join the department by another member of the SDE.
>
> Clearly, this degree of homogeneity is not simply the result of chance. Explicit and implicit recruitment policies have produced this result. (Kirby and Tollman 1967, p. 39)

This homogeneity does not stop with state departments of education. In the Equality of Educational Opportunity survey, Coleman and his associates (1966) discovered a number of basic similarities among principals of elementary and secondary schools.

Coleman reports that elementary school principals are predominantly male (80 percent) and white (85 percent). White pupils have a 95 percent chance of having a white principal. Elementary principals are well schooled (80 percent have an M. A. degree), having studied either elementary education or social science (56 percent) in a public teachers college (38 percent) or other public college (34 percent) that was virtually an all-white institution (75 percent).

Sixty-two percent of elementary principals believe the neighborhood school should be maintained regardless of racial imbalance. Seventy-nine percent believe busing should be only to neighborhood schools or for relieving overcrowding. Only 11 percent believe busing should be used to achieve racial balance. This is indeed a homogeneous group.

Heterogeneity is not substantially greater among principals of secondary schools. They are exclusively male (98 percent) and predominantly white (87 percent). Again a white student has a 95 percent chance of having a white principal. Secondary principals are also well schooled (88 percent have an M. A. degree), having attended a public teachers college (29 percent) or other public college (40 percent) that was largely white (77 percent).

Secondary principals are less interested in maintaining the neighborhood elementary school but are as likely as their elementary school colleagues to oppose busing to achieve racial balance in schools.

Although Coleman's data were collected in 1965, I have no reason to believe there have been major shifts in any of these attributes since then.

A more recent study of elementary school principals (NEA 1968) corroborates much of the Coleman data. This study reports that most elementary school principals are males (75 percent) and moved from elementary classroom teaching directly into their first principalship (61 percent). About half (56 percent) report no ambition to move up the school hierarchy. Among those who do, however, 21 percent want to be superintendents and 16 percent want to be college teachers. Most have at least an M. A. degree (80 percent) and the highest percentage took undergraduate degrees in "social studies" (41 percent).

A number of activities and attitudes of elementary school principals are of interest. First, they tend to join organizations. Almost all belong to some kind of organization, with churches and religious organizations (87 percent) predominant. From there, however, membership in other kinds of organizations falls off dramatically. Thirty-nine percent belong to political organizations while only 19 percent belong to intercultural relations or civil rights groups, a smaller percentage than belong to patriotic or veterans groups (24 percent).

Because almost every superintendent of schools was at one time

a principal, there should be no real differences between the groups. Available data largely confirm this expectation. The superintendent is described in some detail in a recent publication of the American Association of School Administrators (AASA 1971). The typical superintendent is a male (99 percent). He was raised in a small town or rural area (86 percent) even if he is currently superintendent of a district with 100,000 or more pupils (60 percent). His first superintendency was in a district with less than 3,000 students (85 percent), and he has remained in the same state as his first superintendency (92 percent). In training and career activities he is very much like his colleagues, the principals.

For my purposes, several attitudes expressed by the typical superintendent, as revealed in the AASA report, serve best to describe him. He was asked to state the critical issues facing American schools. Choosing from a list of eighteen items, he ranked school finance and the demand for new ways of teaching first and second. His hope for greater visibility of the superintendency he placed third. Finally, he ranked "social-cultural issues such as race relations, integration or segregation" *eleventh* (this issue was ranked third by superintendents in districts with 100,000 or more pupils).

In a 1967 paper, Usdan presented a qualitatively different picture of the issues, at least in large cities. For him, issues of race and class (social-cultural issues) are of paramount importance.

Apparently, according to the AASA report, superintendents do not believe that social and cultural issues have much impact on their careers. Out of six problems that, if intensified, would cause superintendents to leave the field, "social-cultural ferment" was ranked last, while "attacks on superintendents" was ranked first. Superintendents in districts with more than 25,000 pupils, however, gave first ranking to "social-cultural ferment."

AASA gave superintendents the opportunity to express their opinions on the kinds of specialists that are most needed in the schools. From the responses, AASA constructed national rankings, some of which are listed in figure 1.

It appears that these respondents have not been alerted to the need for change in American education. To quote from Usdan:

> It is my opinion, and I do not wish to be melodramatic, that nothing less than our democracy itself is at stake in our deteriorating big city school systems. If the increasing masses of the disadvantaged in the Great

FIGURE 1

RANKINGS OF THE TYPES OF SPECIALISTS NEEDED IN SCHOOLS AS PERCEIVED BY SUPERINTENDENTS

Specialist Type	*Rank*
Curriculum and Instruction	1
General Administrators	2
Research and Development	10
Human Relations	13
General Planners	15
Change Specialists	17

Cities, particularly ghettoized members of minority groups, are not given the educational opportunities they need and deserve, I have very serious reservations about the viability of our democracy. (1967)

Superintendents have been socialized to a view of schooling and of their responsibilities as leaders that is strikingly at odds with some obvious descriptions of reality. It is not too harsh to suggest that this large group of white males is not, at least in urban areas, a likely source of meaningful reform.

The other reform strategy mentioned earlier, that of recruiting to school administration persons of a different view, may not produce change either, but it is promising enough that some universities are making serious attempts to implement new recruiting and selecting devices.

THE ROLE OF UNIVERSITIES

A question that is always before professors of school administration is how to define the university role in recruiting and selecting the individuals who will be trained to serve as administrators.

This question requires some discussion because the presence of any one of at least five conditions could preclude a university role of any magnitude in implementing new patterns of recruitment and selection. These five conditions are as follows:

1. Legislative action will break professional control of certification.

2. Local education agencies will take effective control of identifying potential school administrators.
3. Local community groups will take effective control of identifying potential school administrators.
4. The civil servant model in education will be scrapped and nonobjective criteria will replace the current set of presumably rational criteria.
5. It will be decided that American education needs little change and that different kinds of persons are not needed as administrators.

LOSS OF PROFESSIONAL CONTROL

During the past forty years school administrators and professors of school administration have effectively consolidated their control over selection of the men and women who succeed them. The basis for their control is the universal requirement that administrators be licensed by the state. Through their professional associations, administrators and professors have, for the most part, had their way in defining licensing requirements, the means by which those requirements will be met, and the institutions that will be permitted to prepare persons to satisfy the requirements. The result has been a limiting of the pool of persons who can be chosen as school administrators.

There is some evidence that a few states will permit unlicensed people to serve as school administrators. For example, California and Oregon now permit persons without licenses to be chosen as superintendents. Texas has waived licensing requirements for five years, but only for fellows of the National Program for Educational Leadership (NPEL).* Although no state permits unlicensed people to be employed as school principals, there is pressure in California, at least, to change the requirement.

By implication, if states remove or substantially modify licensing restrictions, university departments of educational administration may cease to play an important role in preparing school administrators. If men and women can come to school administration

*The National Program for Educational Leadership is an experimental effort to attract to school administration men and women who are at mid-career in other occupations. It is funded under the Education Professors Development Act.

through many and diverse routes, the universities' monopoly on preparation might be broken. If universities lose their function in preparation, the question of criteria for selection into traditional training programs becomes academic.

SCHOOL-DISTRICT-DETERMINED CRITERIA

A second condition under which the universities could become relatively uninvolved in new selection criteria is systematic and explicit selection of administrator candidates by local school districts. Although the current arrangements suggest an effective implicit alliance between universities and school districts, these arrangements could change. Decision-makers (administrators, officials of teacher unions, and school board members), especially in large cities, might decide to preselect administrator candidates and to send them to universities for training. Under this arrangement, the universities would be constrained by a contract to successfully train any persons sent to them by the district.* If the university refused to relinquish its selection prerogative, the school district could refuse to employ the university's graduates.

Such an arrangement would not violate existing certification laws and, if promoted by large districts or coalitions of suburban districts, might be successful in changing the current balance of power.

CITIZEN-DETERMINED CRITERIA

The pressure for community control is real and, some suggest, here to stay. As Cohen has said in reference to the struggle for control:

> The first [community control] has a certain political price—as the convulsions in New York revealed—but it gives the appearance of costing little otherwise. In addition to this enormous political advantage, it has behind it the gathering momentum of profound changes in black politics, culture and society. (1969)

If we assume that community groups will gain effective control of a number of schools and will control employment of administra-

*A modified contract of this sort has been reached between the University of Tennessee and the City of Nashville under funding of the Education Professions Development Act. In the agreement the city school district is permitted to select candidates, though formal acceptance belongs with the university.

tors, we can easily envision that they might decide to preselect administrative trainees. This situation is parallel to that of increased school district influence.

If community groups can succeed in controlling placement and recruitment of administrators, some changes in the criteria for selection into training programs can be anticipated. Again, as Cohen has observed:

> It is easy to see why the anti-colonial position is anathema to the established authorities. Among other things, in selecting school personnel, advocates of this position seek to substitute what amounts to a test of *political loyalty* for a series of universalistic "professional standards." In last year's school dispute in New York, for example, the Oceanhill Board was accused of racism and of violating due-process guarantees for teachers, but whether or not this was true, the real issue was the Board's effort to apply a test of political consensus to educators. (emphasis added) (1969, pp. 237-238)

Professors of school administration will have some important value choices to make if Cohen's analysis is accurate. They may be faced with having to teach candidates not of their choosing in order to continue to engage in training. If professors find such candidates not acceptable, they may discover that their influence over the training of urban administrators will diminish.

DIMINUTION OF THE CIVIL SERVANT MODEL

The civil servant model is used here to denote the following beliefs: that a systematic relationship exists between precareer training of a codified type and subsequent career performance; that a series of examinations (written and oral) can and should serve as screens for employment; that once employed, an employee is presumed to work effectively, within rather broadly and generally defined limits; and that the employing organization has an obligation to ensure the employee's continued employment within the organization.

The adoption of this model in education has more or less coincided with reform within the national government. To escape the presumed evils of patronage associated with machine politics, educators and officials in governmental agencies instituted a series of "objective" tests of employee suitability. As a result, principalships can no longer be purchased from a precinct captain or

granted as a reward for past services to the machine.

However, adoption of the civil servant model appears to have two undesirable consequences. The first is that citizens find it increasingly difficult to hold civil servants accountable. Although citizens can replace elected officials with other elected officials, incompetent or insensitive bureaucrats are not necessarily removed as a result. The second is that in times of organization crisis, decision-makers who may wish to remove some personnel and to accelerate the careers of others often must take dramatic action to effect change.*

If these dysfunctions are serious enough and if the civil servant model is challenged at its base through such mechanisms as the employee selection guidelines of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964), the whole system might be overturned (Bridges and Baehr 1971). I do not know what might replace it.

NO CHANGE FOR NEED

If American schooling needs a series of small adjustments rather than major change, the universities probably need not be concerned about new selection criteria. American schooling has changed in the past and will continue to change, and university trainees can be expected to participate in the changes. If this condition prevails, the old recruitment and selection criteria can be retained.

Notwithstanding the complaints of intellectuals and the defeats of tax and bond elections, the American public may be reasonably satisfied with its schools. Although schoolmen's attempts to make dramatic changes often meet with community resistance and administrators take risks when they decide to change things, most studies of disagreement between administrators and citizens over administrator role definitions and performance seem to be studies

*In Los Angeles during periods of conflict when the board of education wanted to place blacks or Chicanos as principals in certain schools, there were no blacks or Chicanos on "the list." The board had to amend regulations that had been developed over thirty years, creating a great deal of intraorganization tension and dissatisfaction. Those men and women (all white) who had worked up on "the list" were most dissatisfied when they saw their "places" being summarily shifted.

of disagreement over marginal issues (Gross, Mason, and McEachern 1958; Foskett and Wolcott 1967; Foskett 1969; and Yee 1970). These studies do not indicate that citizens are profoundly and intensely dissatisfied with schools and school administrators.

Having discussed five conditions that would preclude any serious university role in the development and implementation of new selection criteria, I wish to speculate about two conditions under which continued university effort in this direction would be justified.

First, administrator trainers have a vested interest in assuring that, whatever happens, their careers as trainers are not terminated or severely constrained. So motivated, they can create arrangements that serve to alleviate the obvious criticisms of the selection process and can trust that America's faith in university training as a necessary prerequisite for school administration will remain basically intact. The strategy, in this case, would be to engage in a series of small, dramatic experiments in which a great many symbols of the old, explicit selection criteria are thrown down, but the basic implicit criteria are retained. This could be done easily by beginning now to build coalitions with those who share the trainers' values but who represent other constituencies—citizen groups, school districts, and the like.

However, there are two obvious disadvantages to the scheme. The first is that it might be discovered. If it were, departments of educational administration might be subjected to the sorts of pressures being directed at medical schools, law schools, and school districts, a phenomenon these departments have not yet experienced as a group.

The second disadvantage is that the selection screens might accidentally be modified enough that a small number of "undesirables" would be chosen. It is possible a few men and women who have values far different from those desired could have a large impact on preparation programs. As students they might be able to alter drastically the conditions of students, the roles of professors, and the criteria for selection of subsequent students.

The second reason to justify a continued role of universities in finding new selection criteria is that it may be decided American schooling needs basic change. If this view becomes widespread, the universities can contribute to bringing about important changes by training, preparing, or simply certifying men and women who are different from those trained in the past. In effect, this means that

men and women of a different stripe from those who are now administrators would be in a position to make changes. The universities could serve society by finding them and attracting them to school administration.

Traditional Recruiting Pools

It may be useful to describe briefly the most obvious pool of potential selectees—teachers. In all states experience as a teacher, generally three years' experience, is a prerequisite for an administrative license. Thus, assuming that most universities will not adopt new selection criteria for some time, the major recruiting pool is likely to be teachers.

In the early 1960s Charters (1963) described the model school teacher as "predominantly college-educated, native born, Protestant, white, middle-aged, married females of middle-class and possibly rural or small-town origin."

Data generated in the late 1960s confirm these generalizations. The Equality of Educational Opportunity survey (Coleman and others 1966) provides gross data on how teachers responded to a series of questions about issues in education. Eighty-four percent of elementary and 80 percent of secondary teachers said they believed in the neighborhood school. Twenty-nine percent of elementary and 28 percent of secondary teachers believed in busing to achieve desegregation. Forty-three percent of elementary and 44 percent of secondary teachers said they believed in racial mixing of faculties and pupils. Finally, only about half of the teachers said they would definitely reenter teaching as a career if given the chance.

Two important phenomena appear when the characteristics of teachers and administrators are compared. The first is that although the teaching corps is at least 50 percent female, the administrative corps is about 90 percent male. The explanation for this probably rests on two factors: life patterns of teachers and cultural occupation myths.

Because all states require teaching experience for administrator certification, the recruiting pool is limited to those who stay in teaching. Although we do not have national survival rates, some evidence suggests that as few as 20 percent of a teacher cohort remain beyond the fifth year in the district in which they began

teaching (Charters 1967). Further, the average tenure of teachers in Coleman's sample was twelve years. It is clear that many teachers leave teaching and that many more move from one district to another.

Because current superintendents were teachers for an average of six or seven years before they assumed their first administrative posts (AASA 1971), the rapid turnover of teachers has an obvious limiting effect on the pool of administrative recruits. The pool is traditionally restricted to that relatively small percentage of male teachers who manage to stay in teaching despite some obvious incentives to leave (Charters 1967). They are the persistent ones.

The second important phenomenon is that despite substantial personnel turnover, teachers and administrators seem to think very much alike. The obvious explanation is that teachers, like all occupational groups, undergo important socializing experiences. Those who remain in education probably accept, or can accommodate themselves to, its occupational mores. Or more generally:

> A curable occupational work molds the body, mind, and behavior of its members . . . Each occupation tends thus to remake its members in its own image. And the longer an individual stays in the same occupation the deeper is the transformation. (Sorokin *in* Charters 1963)

Thus, the typical potential recruit to administration is one who has stayed in teaching and, presumably, has come to accept the dominant mores of his occupation.

Despite the apparent uniformity of this recruiting pool, the recruit to administration may be different from the aspirant who is not recruited. Although research in such areas as leadership has revealed few characteristics differentiating leaders from nonleaders, our knowledge of the characteristics of administrators is fairly rich. We do know, I believe, the implicit behavioral criteria for recruitment into administration. Aside from persistence in teaching, the successful aspirant probably demonstrates greater compliance with implicit work rules than does the unsuccessful. He keeps a quiet, orderly classroom, makes few "mistakes" in dealing with parents, volunteers for a host of activities, and tries a few new teaching techniques.* In short, he becomes a "successful" teacher.

---

*See Ron Blood, "The Function of Experience in Professional Preparation, Teaching and the Principalship," (Unpublished Ph.D. diss., Claremont Graduate School, 1965); and Robert Stout, research in progress.

Although on gross measures of personality characteristics such a person may appear similar to most adult males, he has learned the route to administration and has behaved in the manner expected of him.

The folklore surrounding the successful aspirant also demands that he "like kids." The behaviors that signal such a psychological state are complex and, I believe, not entirely congruent with occupational rhetoric. "Liking kids" seems to be a state that is, perhaps, better translated as liking the feeling of being the primary influence in a social situation that includes a large group of children. Thus, it is not the "kids" who are liked, but the situation in which the teacher interprets and defines the world for the children. As Carlson puts it:

> The experience of the school district with programmed instruction seems to indicate that teachers have a somewhat compelling need to perform. Perform is taken to mean: to capture and hold the attention of a number of students and to serve continuously as the mediator, between the student and the information. (1965; see also Kilman 1971 and Jackson 1968)

I believe this understanding partly explains the general eagerness of administrator recruits to reach positions that prevent continuing contact with children, except as authorities, and that legitimately preclude engagement with the immediate needs of children. Once in these positions, administrators can, without recognizing the inconsistency, say they act in the best interests of children while acting entirely in the interest of adults.

An excellent empirical case for using behavioral criteria in selecting administrator candidates has been made by McIntyre (n.d.). I offer the above discussion as evidence that a set of implicit behavioral criteria has been in use for years and that current administrators and recruits have been chosen by it.

In an excellent paper, Bridges (1971) develops a substantial theoretical argument for establishing administrator selection criteria that correlate with desirable management styles. He posits four factors that, he argues, predict managerial styles and vary systematically:

1. the yardsticks the principal uses to measure his personal success
2. his capacity to function effectively without knowledge of results
3. his beliefs about cause-result relationships
4. his responses to known successes and failures

Current administrative styles, as described by Bridges, contain a set of implicit criteria by which administrators are chosen—criteria that confirm the description of administrator selection generated above. For example, Bridges describes four modes of measuring personal success: the GASer, the enlightened (and self-serving) maverick, the advocate for subordinates, and the efficiency expert. Although none of these modes is very praiseworthy, I believe each accurately reflects a set of criteria by which administrators are presently recruited.

Throughout this section I have been arguing that the traditional pool of administrative aspirants is not a very promising group from which to expect deliberate and wide-scale changes in American schools. The group's lack of promise is caused by such structural factors as occupation-life patterns and socialization mechanisms. I have argued that the implicit criteria used to select candidates have, unfortunately, worked extremely well—the administrators of American schools seem to be quite homogeneous, reflecting, no doubt, the general press for homogeneity in American schooling.

3

Change and the Schools

Many respectable practicing intellectuals and not a few citizens have expressed serious doubts about the direction and quality of American education. What is more, they have been able to offer evidence of some scope and quality to support their positions.* It is clear to these groups that some changes in American education are in order.

Directions and Results

If it is decided that change is necessary and possible, educators must consider what they think the directions and results of change should be. Attempting to determine the proper directions and results of change is difficult for two reasons: it requires the

*The two most obvious collections of evidence are the Coleman report and the report of the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, *Racial Isolation in the Public Schools.*

examination of a whole set of cultural assumptions, and it requires evaluation of the goals of education.

As for the first difficulty, those who have been socialized by American or Western institutions have an especially hard time considering alternatives to current practice. I believe it is not ridiculous to suggest that our generally held beliefs in reason, linear thought, compromise as a resolution of conflict, universalistic standards of assessment, specificity of occupational role, achievement-based status, a relatively long period of childhood and adolescence, the literary tradition of the written word, and a society based on industry prevent our inventing or considering many alternatives. I know of no good way either to assess or remedy this difficulty if, in fact, it exists. However, an obvious first step is listening to those who say their cultural assumptions are different from ours.*

The second difficulty, evaluation of the goals of education, may lend itself to futile discussion. There may be social forces of such magnitude at play that it is quixotic for schoolmen consciously to attempt radical alteration of the schools. Although I am neither capable of nor interested in addressing at length the question of the school's role in society, a brief look at some social forces that schoolmen may not be able to change seems useful.

Conflict over the Purposes of Schooling

In a typically brilliant essay, Max Weber discussed the inevitable consequences of such bureaucratization of the social order as now exists. He believed that bureaucracies depend on "specialists" rather than on "the cultivated man."

> Expressed in slogan-like fashion, the "cultivated man," rather than the "specialist," has been the end sought by education and has formed the basis of social esteem in such various systems as feudal, theocratic, and patrimonial structures of dominion in the English notable administration, in the old Chinese patrimonial bureaucracy, as well as under the rule of demagogues in the so-called Hellenic democracy.
>
> The term "cultivated man" is used here in a completely value-neutral sense; it is understood to mean solely that the goal of education

*At the University of Minnesota, for example, there seems to be an attempt to listen. About twenty American Indians are enrolled in training programs designed to capitalize on their different assumptions about schools and organizations.

> consists in the quality of a man's bearing in life which was *considered* "cultivated," rather than in a specialized training for expertness.
>
> (Gerth and Mills 1946)

Weber felt that increased bureaucratization and its concomitant need for trained specialists influence the kind of education a society will provide. This influence is felt particularly in a society's acceptance of the bureaucratic model of authority. Specifically, Weber singled out the "expert examination" as the instrument of influence.

> Above all, the development is greatly furthered by the social prestige of the educational certificates acquired through such specialized examinations. This is all the more the case as the educational patent is turned to economic advantage. Today the certificate of education becomes what the test for ancestors has been in the past, at least where the nobility has remained powerful: a prerequisite for equality of birth, a qualification for a canonship, and for state office.
>
> (Gerth and Mills, p. 241)

In two marvelous sentences he captured what seems to be the essence of much of today's criticism of the "educational establishment."

> On the other hand, democracy fears that a merit system and educational certificates will result in a privileged "caste." Hence democracy fights against the special-examination system.
>
> (Gerth and Mills, p. 240)

It may be that democracy has lost the fight (Young 1961). On the other hand, it may be that large groups of citizens are just beginning to establish the grounds on which to start a real fight. These groups are arguing that ability tests, given to children by school personnel to determine subsequent placement and probable success of the children, systematically discriminate against children with particular attributes: non-Anglo birthrights and low family income.

These groups are also arguing that if life chances are to be determined by school-based examinations, it is the school's responsibility, not the child's, to ensure successful performance. Therefore, they are attempting to create mechanisms through which they can hold school personnel accountable for a child's performance.

As vocal as the prochange groups are, it must be made clear that not all people advocate change. The country is divided

philosophically over the goals of schooling. On one side are citizens who view the world as a tough, competitive place where toughmindedness, aggressiveness, and relative obedience are necessary for success. Those who hold this view tend to demand that the schools value competition, discipline, and the acquisition of basic skills. They also believe that school personnel have no business "messing around" with political or moral questions. Persons in this group are likely to maintain that discipline in the schools is not strict enough, that students should not have much to say about school matters, and that corporal punishment is desirable (Gallup 1970).

On the other side are citizens who view the world as a somewhat more benign place. They seem to argue that acquisition of reading and writing skills probably can be taken for granted and certainly need not be accompanied by frustration or viewed as "hard work." Their interest is in having schools teach complexity of thought, toleration and cooperation, and the relativity of political and moral questions. They tend to favor attempts to "humanize" schools and to applaud such techniques as open schools, cross-age teaching, and the like.

I believe that these two positions are based on real differences and that conflict over the purposes of schooling underlies many superficial conflicts about pedagogical technique and school operation.* Because these differences are real, most attempts to change the purposes of schooling are likely to be met with substantial resistance from a large segment of the population.

For this group of citizens, the schools are functioning properly, though they might be made a little "better." It is fruitless to speculate about what motivates resistance to change. Suffice it to say that attempts at change, if perceived as threats to essential schooling functions, energize substantial numbers of citizens willing to expend their personal and collective resources to preserve the schools as they are.

Granted that there will be resistance, the question remaining for those committed to change is, What should the results be? Even among those who advocate change, the degree of change desired is

*See Douglas Mitchell, "Educational Conflict." (Unpublished Ph.D. diss., Claremont Graduate School, 1972) for empirical verification of the scope and intensity of disagreement among citizens who act as the educational politicians in several communities.

arguable. Some contend changes that readjust such factors as the distribution patterns of educational resources are probably sufficient. Others take the position that only radical restructuring of the purpose of education will suffice. Because of these disagreements, one who sets out to make deliberate changes in schools is subject to criticism and occasional invective from others who advocate change. Apparently, those who press for change see so few attempts to accomplish it and are so committed to their own schemes that they feel more endangered by a person who effects change of the "wrong" kind than by someone who is uninterested in change. The "wrong" changes, it is argued, not only complicate the strategies of those advocating the "right" changes but may, in creating any change, cause potential allies to lose interest in pressing for the "right" changes.

Some scholars evidently have concluded that change of sufficient magnitude is impossible within the current system. These scholars either have established alternative "communities of learning" or have argued for the abolition of compulsory schooling altogether. They admit that the current system is extremely successful, but that it is successful at the wrong things—encouraging children to accept inequity and basic inhumanity (Illich 1971). As interesting as the changes advocated by these people may be, they are not within the scope of this paper. It is changing the purposes of the present educational system that interests those involved in recruiting and selecting administrative trainees who satisfy new criteria.

Administrators and Change

So little is known about the processes and consequences of change that a strategy of recruiting different kinds of persons into administration for the purpose of effecting change is, for the most part, an act of faith.* Some evidence suggests that, because of their political vulnerability, administrators may be the least likely persons to effect changes (Waller 1932).

Conversely, administrators are expected to be educational leaders, and leadership is presumed to include system reorientation or change (Griffiths 1964). As Brickell implies, administrators

*See Louis M. Smith, and Patricia M. Keith, *Anatomy of Educational Innovation* (New York: John Wiley, 1971), for a good analysis of the limits of our knowledge.

may be essential for educational innovation to take place.

> New types of instructional programs are introduced by administrators. Contrary to general opinion, teachers are not change agents for instructional innovations of major scope. Implication: To disseminate new types of instructional programs, it will be necessary to convince administrators of their value. (1961)

Carlson (1965) accepted this argument and focused his study of educational innovation on superintendents in two states. His curves of diffusion and adoption of innovative practices replicate curves obtained in studies of adoptions in such other areas as medicine and farming. Further, by using personal characteristics of superintendents as independent variables, he was able to distinguish districts with different incidences of adoption. He reported that "innovative" districts had superintendents who tended to

> (1) be younger, (2) know well fewer of their peers, (3) be sought less often for advice, (4) receive higher professional ratings, (5) exhibit greater accuracy in the judgment of their rates of adoption of innovations, (6) have shorter tenure in their present positions, and (7) seek advice and information from more persons outside the local area. (p. 65)

Such evidence suggests that certain administrators can effect change. More important for our purposes, however, is the argument that administrators *must* be among those effecting change. As Cunningham has said:

> We're sick of frauds, charlatans, pseudos, liberals, conservatives, whites, blacks and reds. Advocates for change have become Pavlovian; they have lost their finesse . . . Respect, love, quality have vanished.
>
> But these are wasted yearnings. The issues are before us. There is no escape with dignity. The problems extend beyond the personal or professional capacities of principals or professors. Solutions, if they can be found however, will be more socially satisfying if professionals are prominent partners in the achievement of reforms. (Cunningham 1971)

I shall continue to resist the temptation to suggest that I know the direction change should take or that I have a plan for it. However, it does seem that the two characteristics of schools subject to strongest criticism are their mindless dehumanization and their presumption that all schools and school programs should

be like one another.* It seems that at the base of attempts to recruit different persons to school administration is the tacit admission that, educationally, differences among schools may be more important than similarities. Although challenges to the homogeneity of schooling goals are not yet well developed, I suspect that an increasing emphasis on diversity of goals will occupy the school politics arena.

*This is not, of course, a presumption applied to schools attended by poor or black or Chicano children. Demonstrably, American citizens have decided that the form be the same for these schools, but that the substance be less adequate.

4

New Practices

Universities that have attempted to recruit different people into administrator preparation programs have been forced to develop new sources of recruits. In the main, they have elected to recruit among two groups that exhaust the universe of potential candidates: "unsuccessful" teachers and nonteachers. Among nonteachers, the current recruiting emphasis appears to be on persons who either have not begun careers or have established careers in other fields but might be enticed to make a shift in occupations.

New Recruiting Pools

Although the criteria by which "unsuccessful" teachers and nonteachers are selected are not very specific, certain assumptions are shared by most recruiters who have turned to these groups. The assumptions are as follows:

- Current aspirants are too much like their predecessors to be expected to make changes.

- Persons with other experiences and persons socialized in other ways may have different perspectives and, as a result, might be able to ask new questions of schooling to create new mechanisms.
- Conscious recruitment of persons different from those in the old pools will represent new combinations of interests that might produce change.
- Recruitment from new groups will require developing a different set of implicit and explicit selection criteria.

I believe that, at the moment, these assumptions represent hopes rather than immediately visible realities. These recruiting attempts are so new that their effects on schools are not yet apparent. However, data are being collected by program heads, and it is generally hoped that some facts will be established.

A deliberate attempt to select administrative trainees according to new criteria seems to require a shift in recruiting mechanisms. Universities will have to invest in active recruiting rather than continue to rely on the present essentially self-selecting processes in which candidates are expected to apply without being recruited.

In this section I shall raise some questions about new and different recruiting mechanisms* in order to begin delineating some options available and specifying some decisions that must be made. I shall discuss two efforts that represent the major alternatives mentioned above—recruiting "unsuccessful" teachers and recruiting nonteachers.

"UNSUCCESSFUL" TEACHERS

By "unsuccessful" teachers I mean those who have been troublesome to administrators and unwilling to conform to organization norms.

This group of potential recruits contains some persons who would make valuable contributions as administrators. These are the constructive troublemakers, the ones with ideas and plans. They have formed intellectual and emotional resolutions that

*I shall rely heavily on experiences generated by the National Program for Educational Leadership (NPEL) and by the Administrator Preparation Program (APP) of the Claremont Graduate School. These two programs are not exhaustive, but they are solid attempts to recruit different persons.

allow them to work in and on organizations to create change. There are others who can be termed losers. They simply make trouble; they do not make a difference. Thus, the first task in recruiting from this pool is to invent ways to recruit the constructive troublemakers.

Assuming that the winners and losers can be differentiated (a point to which I shall return later), two problems emerge. The first is attracting the winners to a program; the second is the political cost of doing so.

The desirable recruit may not be tremendously excited by the opportunities the university offers him. It is likely he has come to several conclusions about himself and the university. First, he is convinced that what he is currently doing is extremely important to education. Entering a training program would reduce his energy for his current work. Second, it is likely he has little reason to believe that the training offered is going to do very much for him. He has had training for sixteen to eighteen years already, has decided that that training was bad for him, and is committed to changing the whole educational system. In addition, he believes he is successful and is so in spite of his training.

Third, if he guesses or knows that the university and the local school district are cooperating in his training, he immediately suspects one of two things: he is being bought off to be socialized, or he is being got rid of, never to return to the district. Finally, if he has worked closely with community groups or with political organizations, he faces the real possibility that they will perceive his entrance into a training program as selling out to the establishment.

Thus, the university is faced with a tremendous job in establishing its credibility with such a candidate and his supporters. There are, however, a number of ways to work on the problem. The most obvious is to have a training program that the candidate thinks will be helpful to him. The second is to have a good history of honesty and a faculty that has demonstrated its interest in the problems the candidate thinks are important. The third is to provide effective mechanisms through which the candidate can change the program if it does not suit his needs. The fourth is to provide him with real opportunities to determine who will be recruited in the next group of candidates. The last is to promise him that if he is going to invest himself, the university is also willing to make a substantial investment in his welfare; he has to be convinced that

his sacrifice will be matched by the university's.

To the extent the university makes at least these arrangements, the probability of attracting nontraditional trainees is increased.

Even though a program may be successful in its recruiting, it cannot ignore the political cost of being associated with change. Because of the symbiotic relationship between the university and the school district, a university's deliberate attempt to legitimate the careers of identified troublemakers may generate resistance and anger. Although a superintendent may be convinced that a "new breed" of trainee will ultimately be to his advantage, his subordinates may not. These subordinates may resist change because the nontraditional candidate has been troublesome: principals have tried to transfer him, curriculum supervisors have feared him, his supporters have badgered assistant superintendents and have been noisome audiences in board meetings, and he has always seemed to be around when someone from outside the system was challenging someone inside. In contrast, the lower-echelon career bureaucrats have followed all the rules and have done what the university told them to do to get "the degree." The university's support of troublemakers may anger these bureaucrats.

Although I may have oversimplified and overdramatized, I believe that second-, third-, and fourth-line administrators do resist university efforts to recruit nontraditional candidates. The political costs of doing so are, therefore, potentially high. They involve placement difficulties, resistance to providing training opportunities, and diminution of research and consulting opportunities for faculty. It seems to me that the costs have to be borne.

NONTEACHERS

Two pools of nonteacher recruits have been identified: college seniors and men and women at midcareer in other fields. Each group represents different recruiting problems, though two analytically similar problems are apparent—identification and attraction.

The identification of college seniors suitable for a graduate school program is a relatively expensive investment that does not begin to provide any return for years. Cultivating collegiate placement officers and systems is time-consuming and expensive. This expense is increased substantially by the lack of undergraduate programs in educational administration and the disdain in which it is held by many collegiate academics. Educational administration is

hampered further because it does not have an extensive informal network of contacts among college professors of economics, sociology, and the like.

The usual compromise is for a department of educational administration to recruit students from other departments in the same university. In the past, large-scale recruiting of this kind would have been resisted; however, many fields now have an oversupply of graduate students that may make "cooperative" efforts more palatable.

Attracting a recruit is another problem. Professionals-in-training in other fields have been socialized to the reward systems of those fields. Except for psychology, other fields do not reward scholars for interest in education. To compound this low appeal value with hints of actually "doing" administration is to severely limit the field's attractiveness.

A further difficulty in recruiting seniors or graduate students away from business and industry is school administration's inability to offer opportunities for merit promotion, increasing responsibility and salary, exciting work in a technologically advanced system, or social prestige. What is offered instead are an abstraction about doing good and a necessity to teach before being able to administer.

Attempts to recruit persons from midcareer in other fields encounter even more complex problems of identification and attraction. Whereas the recruiting arena for college seniors is relatively small, the arenas for persons at midcareer are immense. Some obvious ways to limit the arenas are available—advertising in some publications and not in others, using the services of executive search groups, establishing a network of nominators, and carefully surveying such education-related areas as city school board politics. Such attempts have not had great success. Even the most impressive current effort, the National Program for Educational Leadership (NPEL), has identified less than 200 really superb candidates. Although NPEL is an intensive, if relatively modest, effort, it has not been overwhelmed with applicants. The applicant ranks will probably increase, however, as the program matures and its graduates assume leadership positions that enable them to recruit new persons.

Recruiting is difficult and expensive even if it can be assumed that large numbers of persons are waiting to be recruited. If that cannot be assumed, then recruiting must be very intense, very

selective, and very accurate in order to generate a reasonably large number of quality candidates. Such is the case with recruiting midcareer persons into educational administration. A number of economic forces tend to keep the recruiting pool small. First, the candidate is asked to give up the possibility of a large salary because school salaries are substantially lower than top-rank industrial salaries and there are proportionately fewer adequate salaries in education.* Second, he must sacrifice the opportunity to accumulate wealth through stock options, bonuses, fringe benefits, and the like. Third, he is asked to forego income during training, a request that may substantially change his family's style of life.†

Although the economic questions may be less troublesome than they appear at first glance (intellectuals and social critics feel that many persons are becoming less acquisitive), other issues pose substantial problems. One problem is the standard administrator training program. If a successful person from another field is told that he must endure what most of the programs demand, he will probably run away as fast as he can. To suggest that eighteen weekly seminars in school law, school finance, personnel administration, and the like are necessary and unavoidable preconditions for a license is, I believe, silly. Midcareer candidates must be offered quick licensing after rich, intense training that capitalizes on the candidates' strengths and their own judgments about what is worth learning. NPEL attempts to provide such training, but its graduates receive no degrees and no licenses.

The chances of attracting midcareer candidates are reduced again if they cannot be promised really exciting work. Unfortunately, the sad fact is that many school administration jobs are not exciting.

I believe, and NPEL has demonstrated, that persons at midcareer can be attracted to educational administration. I do not believe, however, that large numbers can be. Thus, those who are attracted must be very special people and must be placed in crucial jobs.‡

---

*This discussion depends on an assumption: the midcareer people sought are "successful" in what they are doing.

†The National Program for Educational Leadership offers stipends of about $17,000 a year. This is not a high figure but so much higher than anything else in education as to be an issue in national policy discussions of the Office of Education.

‡I have chosen not to discuss the political realities of placement. However, it seems to be a delicate problem whose outcome is uncertain.

Of the two new recruiting pools, the "unsuccessful" teacher pool is probably the most promising source of nontraditional administrators; however, no one knows how large that pool is. If large-scale change is to be effected, what may be a relatively small number of a new kind of administrator must have a large impact in crucial spots. I leave it to the new recruits to discover how to do that.

New Selection Criteria

Recruitment and selection are so related that recruitment criteria also serve as selection criteria. Often, however, selection criteria do not seem related to such other important areas as successful completion of a training program or successful performance in later jobs. So much has been written about why this is so and under what conditions it obtains that such a discussion is unnecessary here.*

Suffice it to say that, at the moment, new selection criteria represent statements of hope or faith. That is, selectors do not know in a scientific sense what they are about. They believe, however, that the new criteria are applicable and that, if applied, they will provide trainees who are different from prior trainees and administrators who are different from prior administrators. Later I shall return to the problem of gathering evidence to support these beliefs.

It can be argued that most new selection criteria are implicitly designed to select for job performance, not for training program success. If they were studied, the criteria for training program success would probably prove to be pretty simple: intelligence, financial support, ability to figure out the particular "system" that operates in the program, and willingness to submit to socialization attempts would probably account for most criteria.

Because new selection criteria are directed toward job success they tend to be dramatic and, if selectors are responsive to them, exceedingly complex. The implicit criterion of the candidate's probability of finding employment further complicates selection. This is so because the universities are establishing criteria that, on the face of them, might make their graduates unemployable (remember the troublemaker). The universities must hope that the candidates can mask their qualities enough to infiltrate schools.

*See, for example, Kenneth McIntyre, "Selection of Educational Administrators," (a position paper of the University Council for Educational Administration), n.d.

One way of discussing sets of new selection criteria is to arrange them on a continuum whose end points are "universal" (objective or value-free) and "specific" (subjective or value-loaded). This criteria continuum is useful for explaining two general strategies that can be used in attempts to select new kinds of people for school administration.

The first strategy is to adopt the universal model and to select according to it. A candidate chosen by this model would be expected to possess to a high degree a large group of qualities or characteristics that, it is presumed, are applicable to success in many settings. In effect, an attempt would be made to select persons who could be corporation presidents as well as school superintendents.

This strategy is based on a desire to redress the phenomenon described by McIntyre:

> Although we have been fortunate in attracting into our field a few people who would undoubtedly compare favorably with the best in any other field, the average student of educational administration is so far below the average student in most other fields, in mental ability and in general academic performance, that the situation is little short of being a national scandal. (McIntyre, n.d., p. 17)

The second strategy is to continue to use specific, value-loaded criteria but to change those criteria. In the past, selectors used criteria that resulted in the selection of "safe" persons. This procedure produced the deleterious effect on education I described earlier.

In the following pages, four lists provide representative examples of selection criteria presently available for use. They begin at the universal end of the continuum and progressively become more specific.

A list of universal selection criteria variables might look something like the list below. A candidate would be judged against the best, or the top quarter, or some specified value on each variable.*

---

*I am indebted to Robert Coughlan of Northwestern University for this list. He constructed it at a meeting of the National Program for Educational Leadership and intended it only to stimulate conversation. He disavowed any claim to its comprehensiveness.

A. Physical Factors
   1. Age
   2. Health-energy level
   3. Race/ethnicity

B. Mental Factors
   1. Ability (overall)
   2. Aptitudes (specific)
   3. Education acquired
   4. Knowledge
   5. Accomplishments

C. Traits/Characteristics
   1. Stability
   2. Industry
   3. Perseverance
   4. Compatibility
   5. Self-reliance
   6. Moral/ethical values

D. Attitudes toward
   1. Leadership
   2. Work/leisure
   3. Authority
   4. Obligations
   5. Relationships

E. Motivation/Drive
   1. Work interest
   2. Economic
   3. Recognition
   4. Achievement
   5. Security
   6. Service
   7. Acceptance
   8. Aspiration level
   9. Age/stage relationship
   10. Power

F. Emotional Maturity
   1. Free from dependence
   2. Free from selfishness
   3. Free from exhibitionism
   4. Free from wishful thinking
   5. Seeks responsibility
   6. Self-discipline
   7. Judgment

G. Dispositions
   1. Confident
   2. Alert
   3. Deliberate
   4. Realistic
   5. Ascendent
   6. Resourceful
   7. Tolerant

Two statements can be made about a list such as this: it is thorough, and it has not been used. Its use is possible, however, since currently available methods and instruments can measure each variable with good accuracy. It might be useful for some university to adopt such a list, to select candidates who display high values on each variable, and to do careful research on the results. The task would be enormous, but if carefully done it might explain why prior research on such variables has not generated very satisfying results.

Another list, one that displays a more "education-specific bias," is currently being used by the National Program for Educational Leadership. That list includes the following criteria:

1. Demonstrated leadership ability
2. Commitment to urban education
3. Recognition that change is necessary and the belief that it is possible
4. A high energy level

5. Stability and maturity
6. A realistic view of educational settings and personal comfort with the idea of working in such settings
7. Value orientations that include an affirming posture toward students and co-workers and the importance of individual dignity and fulfillment
8. A life style that stresses the importance of continuous learning—an openness to and independent quest for knowledge

This list is less comprehensive than the first and seems to reflect some assumptions about both education as a work arena and what is wrong with education. It contains, however, some criteria that are difficult to measure: criteria two, three, and six are more difficult to operationalize than the variables on the first list.

A third list represents an attempt to analyze carefully what is wrong with American education and its administrators and to establish a strategy for change. Its criteria focus on schools as work places and indicate the authors' biases in methods of changing schools. In addition, the list reflects an assessment of what is required to succeed in training programs (Kilman, Muth, and Rodriguez 1970).

A. Inquiry Orientation
   1. Reflect an attitude conducive to the thorough analysis of data in the pursuit of answers to both general and specific problems
      a. Display an awareness of the need to generate data when not at hand
      b. Exhibit an ability to formulate and test hypotheses and/or alternative hypotheses extractable from the data
   2. Reflect a willingness to extract "school-community" values as well as the community's unexpressed value orientations

B. Value Orientation
   1. Recognize the social injustices inherent in present educative process
   2. Exhibit a commitment to change toward a more egalitarian educative system
   3. Recognize and be dedicated to the proposition that education as an institution is vital to the survival of an on-going society in which change and adaptability to change predominate
   4. Demonstrate a willingness to exercise power and influence as necessary to effect change

5. Recognize the need for and the problems inherent in system accessibility
6. Display integrity in, with commensurate commitment to, the identification and support of basic educational issues
7. Exhibit strength of character and resistance to collective pressures

C. Social Relations

1. Display an honest and humane approach in relating to others
2. Recognize the need for and desire to foster an atmosphere of personal accessibility
3. Recognize the existence of power differentials as a phenomenon inherent to social interaction
4. Recognize the need for independent spheres of "competence" for colleagues
5. Recognize the need to generate and accept colleague advice and support

D. Risk Taking

1. Demonstrate a willingness to take a firm stance in support of change-oriented educational values
2. Exhibit a recognition of the efficacy of political compromise
3. Exhibit personal confidence in whatever stance taken such that the probability of success of that enterprise will be greater than the probability of its failure

This list, if adopted, would require a substantial investment in a selection process. The process would probably require thoroughly searching the applicants' backgrounds, using simulation activities, interviewing under stress and nonstress conditions, and collecting a relatively large sample of the applicants' written work. Despite the complexity of the selection process required, the list is, on the face of it, important because of its explicit indication of the values and biases of the selectors. In addition, it reflects a careful analysis of the emphases of the associated training program.

A fourth list is even more specific to education. It also reflects the authors' biases about what is wrong in American education and how to make changes. Further, it assesses more behaviors than the three previous lists (a desirable characteristic, I think).*

*This list of criteria is in use in the Administrator Preparation Program of the Claremont Graduate School.

1. Educational Perspective

   We are aiming at the recruitment of persons who have a sensitive and articulate educational perspective. We are looking for persons who can make administrative decisions which are based on their commitment to, and understanding of, educational processes and who have a demonstrated ability to create and manage the structures to transmit ideas and/or influence behavior.

2. Activist Interest

   We continue to aim at the recruitment of leaders of informal activist and probably community based groups. There appear to be three leadership ingredients that are important among such activists: (a) Such informal groups have reform strategists who develop alternatives to the existing way of doing business; (b) Among the leadership of such informal activist groups are to be found persons capable of defining cultural norms; This process of norm definition builds pressure for the reformation of institutions by identifying the problems which are deserving of immediate attention; and (c) Among the leadership of informal activist groups are to be found persons capable of "feeling mobilization." This task of mobilizing feelings and focusing energies on the change process is essential to the reconstruction of the school system.

3. Formal Organization Skills and Experience

   The most important aspect of formal organization skill or experience for the nominees to the Administrator Preparation Program is an ability to think in systemic terms, and to approach formal organizations with a reconstruction more than an efficiency mentality.

4. Intellectual Attributes

   We aim at the recruitment of persons who can demonstrate substantial intellectual skills in both conceptual synthesis and the treatment of detailed technical information. At least the bachelor's degree is an academic prerequisite for admission.

5. Interaction Skills

   We are aiming to recruit persons who have a high tolerance for ambiguity and an ability to establish a close teamwork relationship with others in the context of both formal and informal organizations.

6. Race and Sex

   We are aiming at a 4-4-2 racial mix (four Black, four Brown, two Anglo). We are also aiming at the recruitment of perhaps three women in next year's class.

If new selection criteria are adopted, the problem of verifying their reliability arises. If the new criteria are near the universal (objective) pole, hundreds of tests and inventories, some with

reasonable histories of reliability and validity, are available for testing the criteria. Of course, tests of the reliability and validity of these methods require large sample sizes, short time-spans, and whole-group predictions. There are no instruments that permit individual predictions over a long time-span.

The use of universal criteria demands that groups rather than individuals be selected and that selection success be judged on the basis of group performance. This method also assumes that a certain, but unidentifiable, percentage of the candidates will fail. It would be reasonable to expect that, in the long run and over the total group, this selection method would produce better quality administrators than those now in the schools.

New criteria at the specific (subjective) end of the continuum also pose verification problems. For example, assume that candidates should be "willing to take risks on behalf of good causes." The best indication of a candidate's willingness to take risks in the future is probably his willingness to do so in the past. This kind of assessment requires that selectors possess a thorough activity history for each candidate, as well as an ability to recognize a risky act when it is recorded. Under some circumstances it is hard to satisfy both conditions. Many activists in ghetto or minority communities are reluctant to display their activities to university committees responsible for selection. This is true particularly when the selectors are white, which almost all professors of school administration are. The activist is in a dilemma: he may want to be selected, but he may be unwilling to trust selectors with information that might cause him legal or career problems.

A second verification problem at the specific end of the continuum is the vagueness of the criteria. I quote from an earlier list:

> We aim at the recruitment of persons who can demonstrate substantial intellectual skills in both conceptual synthesis and the treatment of detailed technical information.

These vague criteria are difficult to measure.

Steps are being taken to overcome the measurement difficulties associated with specific criteria. These steps consist chiefly of extensive information gathering. Personal information about the candidate is solicited from the candidate himself, from persons who have written letters of reference, and from persons who were his subordinates and superordinates but who were not asked for a

letter of reference. Data are gathered from analyses of situational performance tests, from scores on personality inventories, and from results of projective personality tests. The candidate is also asked to submit any other evidence that he thinks is important. To help him submit evidence that would be useful, the candidate is given a list of the criteria according to which he will be selected. It is his responsibility to present whatever evidence he can that he believes shows his congruence with the criteria.

It is clear that these new methods of generating evidence are elaborate and demand that both parties invest substantially in negotiating a candidate's admission. New selection mechanisms also can be elaborate.* These mechanisms require such a variety of evidence-generating methods that a candidate's admission must occur over a long period. For this reason, a candidate is invited to test himself in the university prior to being granted full standing or status.

There is one new selection mechanism that requires little university effort. I alluded to this mechanism in the early pages of this monograph when I suggested that effective selection could be done by school officials or community groups. A recent proposal placed selection responsibilities with activists in minority political groups such as the Mexican American Political Association, the Brown Berets, the Malcolm X Foundation, and others (Almada and Foxworth n.d.). Such an arrangement would not require universities to make any investment in selection.

*McIntyre describes such a mechanism; see "Selection of Educational Administrators," pp. 13-14.

5

The Future

Although I hesitate to speculate very much about what might be, I believe some trends are apparent and worth encouraging. None of these trends is of great magnitude and none is likely to revolutionize selection or education in the near future. Each is, however, interesting and promising.

First, selection appears to be getting some attention in fact as well as in rhetoric. Universities are investing hard resources to identify and attract people they would like to train.

Second, universities are using, or attempting to use, criteria that are different from those used in the past. The universities are seeking people who are tough-minded, dissatisfied with things as they are, different in ethnic or social class heritage, and convinced they can effect major social change.

Third, new methods for generating evidence about candidates are being created. As a result, selection mechanisms are becoming more thorough and more imaginative.

Fourth, universities appear to be willing to enter into new coop-

erative arrangements among themselves. Under such an agreement, a person from Tulsa might be selected by the University of Oklahoma to study in a program at the University of Connecticut. Such consortia arrangements might substantially alter the provincialism that characterizes education.

Fifth, it appears that new persons will be involved in selection. Current students, representatives of community and teacher groups, nonallied citizens, and practicing administrators all can make contributions to selection decisions. I anticipate that they will increasingly do so.

One final area of change is the effect new recruiting and selecting practices may have on the universities instituting them. I believe that deliberate consideration of alternative recruitment and selection criteria requires political and philosophical commitments to defining desired changes. In addition, it may be required that these commitments be made to processes whose outcomes are unclear. It seems that claiming a commitment to a new order imposes an obligation to consistency and honesty and to accountability to groups and individuals to whom professors have not been accountable in the past—namely, students, parent groups, and reform-minded citizens.

Thus, the adoption of new selection criteria probably carries with it the necessity to restructure recruitment, training, and placement. It may even require restructuring the university and the professorship.

If men and women who are committed to the reform of schooling are selected into administrator preparation programs, they are likely to begin by reforming graduate schools of education. They may question such components of the preparation program as requirements, lectures, and the vague connections drawn between theory and practice. They may question their relatively small role in establishing professorial salaries, influencing selections and promotions, and formulating general university regulations. In effect, they may argue that it is their needs, not those of professors or officials, that will determine policy.

As it is said in commerce, *caveat emptor.*

It seems apparent that change is possible. I have tried to suggest that it is also desirable. It is to be hoped that the men and women who will be coming into school administration will explicitly reject

the all-too-accurate description of the traditional school administrator's role:

> nonintellectual, nonemotional, defensive and hence self-justifying, powerless and unrewarding. It occupies the weakest of all ethical positions, the preservation of the status quo, and can offer neither enlightenment nor sustenance in a time of change. In this sense it is positively dangerous to the welfare of society. (Briner and Sroufe 1971)

Bibliography

Almada, David, and Foxworth, Marlin. "Proposal for an Institute to Train Potential Administrators for Ghetto and Barrio Schools." Mimeographed. n.d.

American Association of School Administrators. *The American School Superintendent*, edited by Stephen J. Knezevich. Washington, D.C.: 1971.

Brickell, Henry M. *Organizing New York State for Educational Change*. Albany: State Education Department, 1961.

Bridges, Edwin M. "Personal Success as a Determinant of Principals' Management Style." In *The Principalship in the 1970's*, edited by Kenneth McIntyre. Austin: The Bureau of Laboratory Schools, The University of Texas at Austin, 1971.

Bridges, Edwin M., and Baehr, Melany E. "The Future of Administrator Selection Procedures." *Administrator's Notebook*, 19, 5 (January 1971).

Briner, Conrad, and Sroufe, Gerald. "Organization for Education in 1985." In *Educational Futurism 1985. Challenges for Schools and Their Administrators*. (NCPEA). Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1971.

Campbell, Roald F.; Sroufe, Gerald; and Layton, Donald, editors. *Strengthening State Departments of Education*. Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, The University of Chicago, 1967.

Carlson, Richard O. *Adoption of Educational Innovations*. Eugene, Oregon: The Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, 1965.

Charters, W. W., Jr. "The Social Background of Teaching." In *Handbook of Research on Teaching*, edited by N. L. Gage. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1963.

———, "Some 'Obvious' Facts about the Teaching Career," *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 3, 2 (Spring 1967).

Cohen, David K. "The Price of Community Control." Reprinted from *Commentary in Theory into Practice*, 8, 4 (October 1969).

Coleman, James, and others. *Equality of Educational Opportunity*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966.

Cunningham, Luvern L. "Educational Reform and the Principal." In *The Principalship in the 1970's*, edited by Kenneth E. McIntyre. Austin: The Bureau of Laboratory Schools, The University of Texas at Austin, 1971.

Foskett, John M. *Role Consensus: The Case of the Elementary School Teacher*. Eugene, Oregon: The Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, 1969.

Foskett, John M., and Wolcott, Harry F. "Self-Images and Community Images of the Elementary School Principal," *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 3, 2 (Spring 1967).

Gallup, George. "Second Annual Survey of the Public's Attitudes toward the Public Schools," *Phi Delta Kappan* (October 1970).

Gerth, H. H., and Mills, C. Wright, translators and editors. *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1946.

Getzels, J. W., and Jackson, P. W. "The Teachers' Personality and Characteristics." In *Handbook of Research on Teaching*, edited by N. L. Gage. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1963.

Greer, Colin. *The Principal as Educator*. New York: The Center for Urban Education, 1970.

Griffiths, Daniel, editor. *Behavioral Science and Educational Administration. The Sixty-Third Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II*. Chicago: 1964.

Gross, Neal; Mason, Ward; and McEachern, Alexander. *Explorations in Role Analysis*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1958.

Guthrie, James, and Lawton, Stephen B. "The Distribution of Federal School Aid Funds: Who Wins? Who Loses?" *Educational Administration Quarterly* (Winter 1969).

Guthrie, James; Kleindorfer, George B; Levin, Henry M.; and Stout, Robert T. *Schools and Inequality*. Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1971.

Holt, John. *How Children Fail*. New York: Pitman Publishing Corporation, 1964.

Illich, Ivan. *Deschooling Society*. New York: Harper and Row, 1971.

Jackson, Philip. *Life in Classrooms*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1968.

Kilman, Theodore. "Who Pays the Teacher? Teacher Perception of Rewards." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Claremont Graduate School, Claremont, California, 1971.

Kilman, Theodore; Muth, Rodney; and Rodriguez, John. "Some Criteria and Methods for Selection of Candidates for a Proposed Ph.D. Program in School Administration." Mimeographed. Claremont, California: The Claremont Graduate School, 1970.

Kirby, David, and Tollman, Thomas A. "Background and Career Patterns of State Department Personnel." In *Strengthening State Departments of Education*, edited by R. F. Campbell, G. Sroufe, and D. Layton. Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, The University of Chicago, 1967.

Kozol, Jonathan. *Death at an Early Age.* New York: Bantam Books, 1967.

Martin, Ruby, and McClure, Phyllis. *Title I of ESEA: Is It Helping Poor Children?* Washington, D.C.: Washington Research Project and NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, 1969.

McIntyre, Kenneth. "Selection of Educational Administrators." A position paper of the University Council of Educational Administration, Columbus, Ohio. n.d.

National Education Association. *The Elementary School Principalship in 1968.* Washington, D.C.: Department of Elementary School Principals, 1968.

Smith, Louis M., and Keith, Patricia M. *Anatomy of Educational Innovation.* New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1971.

Sorokin, P. A. *Society, Culture and Personality: Their Structure and Dynamics.* New York: Harper and Row, 1947.

Thomas, J. Alan. *School Finance and Educational Opportunity in Michigan.* Lansing: Michigan Department of Education, 1968.

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. *Racial Isolation in the Public Schools.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967.

Usdan, Michael. "Some Issues Confronting School Administrators in Large City School Systems." *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 3, 3 (Autumn 1967).

Waller, Willard. *The Sociology of Teaching.* 1932. Reprint. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1961.

Yee, Albert H. "Do Principals' Interpersonal Attitudes Agree with Those of Teachers and Pupils?" *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 6, 2 (Spring 1970).

Young, Michael. *The Rise of the Meritocracy.* Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1961.